

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 5

Thursday, February 4, 1960

WISCONSIN RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN
WASHINGTON, D. C.

News Section

DEMOCRATS: *Weakening and worried* (page 1)

BUDGET: *How to save \$5.7 billion* (page 1)

WORLD COURT: *US liberty in danger?* (page 2)

ROCKEFELLER: *Clearly a candidate* (page 2)

FULTON LEWIS: *Suit settled* (page 4)

Democrats in Desperation: The great eruption of mudslinging by "liberal" leaders of the Democratic party last week, when they held their \$100-a-plate pow-wow in the Capital, springs from desperation—as Capitol Hill sees it. Cognizant of the numerous splits and divisions within their party and of popular resentment against "liberal" local rule, the chieftains could find no other posture of offense than oratorical billingsgate. In short, they led from weakness, not from strength.

As the elite of the party machinery gathered in the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, alarm ran through the groups of leaders about the situations in two areas of key importance next November—Chicago and New York.

A sudden reversal of fortune in the Windy City has badly disintegrated the strength of Chicago's Mayor Daley, who two months ago seemed likely to swing victory. This Democratic mayor had appeared to be generally popular. But exposure of sordid corruption in the Chicago police destroyed the Democratic optimism. GOP Governor Stratton threatened to use his own state powers to restore law, order and protection of citizens from gangsterism. Stratton's prestige rose—Daley's sharply declined.

Meanwhile, in New York State, Democratic Boss Prendergast, trying to throw off the shackles of his party's left wing, found himself in such a pickle that he warned that splits in the party threatened loss of the state to the Republicans in next November's election. At the same time, scandals in the regime of New York City's Mayor Wagner downgraded that official's bid for the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination.

With such bleak pictures staring them in the face, the Democratic \$100-a-plate dinner in Washington found no other outlet than crass abuse of Republicans. Former President Truman—who reportedly told friends in the corridors that none of the half-dozen Presidential hopefuls could qualify as a potential winner next fall—vented his frustration with a vulgar, low-level attack on President Eisenhower. He set the note for the other speakers who—obviously by pre-arrangement—concentrated their assault on Vice President Nixon.

The most inept of these attacks came from Senator Symington—usually regarded as a "moderate" among the quartet of Senators hoping for the nomination (although actually Symington's voting record is not "mod-

erate" but ultra-leftist). The Missourian cited the voting record of Nixon, when he was in Congress, as example of how reactionary the VP really is. He said Nixon as Representative and Senator opposed expansion of Social Security; opposed extension of minimum wage coverage; voted to cut down REA funds; voted against "fair prices" for farmers and voted to slash funds for flood control reclamation.

"Ineffective Stu," it is remarked, could not have done better if he had deliberately set out to rally all conservatives to Nixon's banner, not to mention the millions of "little people" whose dollars have been eroded by Roosevelt and Truman handouts to special interest groups.

To use an inelegant current term, the "gut-cutting" job was performed by the farthest-left candidate for the Democratic nomination—Senator Hubert Humphrey. The Minnesotan referred to the Vice President as a "juvenile delinquent." It is believed that this venomous phrase was contributed to his oration by brain trusters in Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers. Reuther is regarded as Humphrey's strongest backer.

Certainly, in their frustration, the Democrats are driven to extremes, when they seek to smear the Vice President for his patriotic role (when he was a young Representative) in exposing Alger Hiss, by terming Nixon a "juvenile delinquent."

However reckless this smear drive appears, those who know what the Democratic strategists have in mind say "there's a method in their verbal madness." The No. 1 objective of Democratic campaign planners remains: split the GOP. By conducting a below-the-belt propaganda drive on Nixon, they hope to damage his image and thus enable the forces behind Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York to regain sufficient strength to stage a blitz at the Republican convention. If such a Rockefeller comeback fails (as seems likely now), it could nevertheless result in GOP dissension of no little bitterness and thereby pave the way for Democratic victory in the election campaign next fall. (See Rockefeller story, page 2.)

How to Save \$5.7 Billion: On top of last week's item in HUMAN EVENTS that the big Budget rises over the past seven years have been in domestic civilian spending, word now comes from a highly placed Government official on precisely where and how much the Budget can be cut, without impairing national security. This official, a professional consultant to the Budget Bureau, has sent HUMAN EVENTS a list of 20 non-defense Budget items in which the Government has substantially increased expenditures over the low figures of earlier Eisenhower Budgets. The table below gives the increase

sought for each item in the current Budget requests over previous Eisenhower "Lowest Expenditure" years (from 1953 to 1957):

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Increase (In Millions of Dollars)</i>
Conduct of foreign affairs	\$130
Foreign information (USIA, etc.)	78
Aviation (Non-defense)	571
Water transportation	210
Housing and "community development" ..	381
Promotion and regulation of business ..	138
Agricultural resources	513
REA and rural telephone loans	151
Agricultural research, etc.	183
Natural resources	637
National Parks, etc.	132
Forests	105
Relief payments	659
Public health	629
Education	284
Libraries, museums, etc.	187
School lunch, vocational rehabilitation, etc.	194
Property management, etc.	287
Legislative and judicial	121
District of Columbia, US possessions ..	73
TOTAL	\$5,663

These 20 items in the 1961 Budget add up to an increase of \$5,663 million over the low point in the years 1953 to 1957. In each case, the increases are far above any that might be caused by monetary inflation. None pertains to national security or defense, our informant assures us. Foreign aid is excluded, even though much of the program is regarded as of doubtful value—at best—for national defense; close examination of the various foreign aid expenditures could add to the savings listed above.

Moreover, the cuts do not include the farm surplus subsidies, a problem which—all on Capitol Hill agree—should be given immediate legislative attention. A workable program could save further billions for the taxpayers.

Thus, fiscal experts see our informant's 5.7 billion figure as by no means a maximum reduction; it should be just the starting point, they say. What is needed to ensure that these cuts are made, say the experts, is another avalanche of protests from the grass roots to overcome the lobbying of the special interest groups and the bureaucrats. The experts endorse the judgment of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce: "Prompt action by a people determined to hold spending in check . . . would probably persuade Congress not only to go along with the President [in achieving a \$4.2 billion surplus], but to increase the surplus by Budget reductions which economy leaders in Congress believe to be possible and desirable."

World Court: The Connally Amendment (sponsored by the late Texas Senator Tom Connally) was approved by the Senate in 1946 after that body voted to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court. The amendment reserved the right for the US to determine which questions are domestic and which could be heard by the international court at The Hague.

Last week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on a proposal by Senator Hubert Humphrey to repeal this safeguard, which knowledgeable observers consider an important bulwark against international imposition into American sovereignty. Although little was settled by week's end, a hard battle was in progress that many thought could have election year implications.

With home-grown leftists backing the Humphrey repeal move, Eleanor Roosevelt once more unmasked herself as the first lady of America Last by stating: "The Senate has never been a body in which new ideas are advanced. It is difficult for the Senate to accept anything which it fears might curtail national sovereignty. Yet if we want a peaceful world, we must curtail to some extent our national sovereignty."

Those opposed to legalistic one worldism are raising many pertinent questions. What, they ask, would be the result if the World Court found some part of the US Constitution in conflict with "international" law? What would the verdict be if the US decided to outlaw the American Communist party, but Moscow objected?

Capitol Hill reasons that to "liberals" such questions are absurd—until we are faced with them.

Rockefeller: The cloak-and-dagger candidacy of Nelson Rockefeller continues to roll along in its self-made political mist as New York and Capitol Hill observers increasingly chime, "Who's kidding whom?"

In a recent Albany dispatch, New York *Daily News* political writer Jim Desmond reported: "Any lingering belief that Governor Rockefeller resigned his Presidential ambitions when he announced last month that he would not challenge Vice President Nixon in the early Republican primaries was dispelled by political and legislative developments here."

Desmond wrote that the word is being spread privately among New York State Republican county leaders to hold back on any endorsement of Nixon's candidacy. Although many Empire State GOPers are anxious to join the Nixon bandwagon, the Governor's sit-tight mandate is being interpreted only one way—Rocky is in the race up to his grin.

Although Nelson faces tough sledding this session with GOP legislators over "liberal" legislation he wants enacted (HUMAN EVENTS, January 28), the benevolent billionaire expects to pick up valuable out-of-state support because of his plan to transfer the ten per cent Federal telephone tax to the states for school aid. Although the measure is Ike-opposed, Rockefeller defended his stand while meeting with the President last week and reportedly he counts on an upsurge of support from Republican politicians whose states are looking for ways to ease local education costs.

As Rocky reached for support beyond New York, more information came out regarding his vast Manhattan propaganda mill. Already reported in HUMAN EVENTS and elsewhere are the doings of the 70-man Rockefeller research staff located on 55th St., just off Central Park West, in a two-building former Rockefeller

town house. This political command headquarters is stocked with elaborate equipment and manned by top specialists—political advisers, speech writers, and research analysts—all ready for possible resumption of his bid to challenge Nixon at the convention.

But there is more evidence that Rocky still hopes to win the GOP crown at the Chicago convention. HUMAN EVENTS staffers have discovered another "nomination operation" heretofore not mentioned in the press: a secret corps of 15 Rockefellerites operating in a seven-room suite on the sixth floor of 10 Rockefeller Plaza. The operation is supposedly "hush hush," with no visitors allowed and all concerned under strict orders not to discuss their activities with outsiders.

Their job is to wade through the Nation's press and clip all references to Rockefeller. Pamphlets are compiled on the good things columnists and editorial writers say about him. As at the 55th St. headquarters, research is done on national and international matters in order to compound the image of Rocky as a leader with a vast store of knowledge on all important issues.

To top observers who follow such "secret" operations, it is apparent that Rockefeller's golden steamroller continues to move in the direction of the White House as the invisible paint covering it begins to chip away.

Cuba: American Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal is beating a path between Cuba and Washington with alarming reports on the growing hostility of the Castro regime toward the United States. As the highest-ranking US official on that explosive Latin American scene, Bonsal has been a ringside witness to the most abusive peace-time treatment of American citizens and property—and the most dastardly attacks on the US Government—ever demonstrated by a foreign power in the Western Hemisphere.

But there is a bit of irony—Washington notes—that it is Bonsal who occupies the thankless front-line position of trying to uphold US prestige in face of almost daily "hate Uncle Sam" tantrums thrown by Fidel Castro; for in 1943, Bonsal reportedly approved a move by the Cuban Government to take over some American property. Today this very move by Castro stands as one of the major causes of ill-feeling in US-Cuban relations. (Thousands of acres have been confiscated from American land owners without compensation or, in many cases, even receipts for the property taken.)

Spruille Braden testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1954 that when he was Ambassador to Cuba he had had to fight both the Cuban Government and the US State Department in preserving the rights of US citizens. Among State higher-ups who objected to the protests he made to the Cuban Government about expropriating American property, Braden told the subcommittee, was Bonsal, who was assistant to Laurence Duggan, then State Department political adviser on Latin American affairs. (Duggan was once identified under oath as a member of a Communist underground group.)

Braden testified: "[Bonsal] stated to me over the

telephone that he agreed with the Cuban intervention [in seizing US property]; he remonstrated at my taking a vigorous stand and thought I was very much out of order."

Now, say veteran Capital observers, Bonsal may be learning the futility and danger of appeasement—the hard way.

British Press: British correspondents have won no accolades for their on-the-spot reporting of recent acts of anti-Semitism in West Germany. With the first outbreak of isolated anti-Jewish incidents, one London daily was fed a lead story which began, "An Army of 50,000 uniformed teen-age Nazis is training in secret camps for 'J-Day'—the day when they launch a new anti-Jewish purge." The report was carried under this banner headline: "Young Nazis Plan Jew Purge."

There immediately followed in the British press other fantastic, though unfounded, claims of a resurgence of nazism, as London newspapers engaged in a "Can you top this?" competition for news copy from Germany. Special journalists were flown from England to Bonn to get more and more on the growing "Nazi" threat. One London daily flatly concluded: "The Nazis are on the march again!"

Other foreign correspondents in West Germany were dumbfounded at the wild stories being cabled home by the English newsmen. Among the skeptics was Baltimore *Sun* writer Bynum Shaw. He investigated the origin of the British reports; his findings were published in the January 24 edition of the *Sun*:

Six months ago, a German reporter wrote a series of articles on Rightist youth organizations. He produced photos of Nazi-type youth leaders in action. At the conclusion of the series, the author viewed these organizations as no real threat to German democracy, although he advised that they should be confronted whenever they stepped out of line. The articles were received matter-of-factly when published, but one British correspondent filed them away for future use.

When the first anti-Semitic incidents occurred—months later—the British newsmen wrote an "exclusive," blowing up and combining the youth organization series with anti-Semitism (without so acknowledging). This was the story containing the report of "50,000 uniformed teen-age Nazis."

Comments *Sun* correspondent Shaw: "No one is quite sure where he got the 50,000 figure unless he made it up One single telephone call to Erwin Gehrhardt, the hard-working philosopher who is press chief of the Interior Ministry, would have established that the membership of the right-wing radical youth organizations is no more than 3,000."

THOMAS E. MARTIN, United States Senator from Iowa: "I commend you highly on your effective presentation of important issues in HUMAN EVENTS; I have always found your publication most interesting and helpful."

In any event, this and the subsequent scare stories from Germany excited the English like nothing has since the days of Hitler's imminent invasion. Their warnings of the renewed threat of Germany to the rest of Europe become louder and louder. And, note disgusted observers in London, a better job of taking attention away from the real danger facing free Europe—the international conspiracy of communism—couldn't have been concocted in Moscow.

Indispensable Man: Congressman Graham Barden (D.-N.C.) has upset conservatives of both parties all over the country by his announcement that he will retire from Congress at the end of this year. Barden has served as a watchdog on legislation affecting labor and education for many years, from his vantage point as Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In this position, he has been able to block or water down all sorts of wild spending efforts for education and to forward genuine reform of labor union evils. He played an important role last summer in the passage of the labor legislation against which the "goon lobby" battled in vain.

The American Good Government Society has nominated Barden for an award for his services in the cause of good government.

Hence, those who understand Barden's great value are appealing to groups and individuals all over the country to write in and urge him to rescind his decision to retire. (Address: Representative Graham Barden, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.) The appeal is all the more urgent because if Barden retires, his probable successor (according to the seniority system) will be Representative Adam Clayton Powell (D.-N.Y.), prominent left-wing spender and friend of labor bosses.

Recommended Reading: *The Case For the South*, by William D. Workman, Jr., Capital correspondent for the Charleston (S. C.) *News and Observer*, \$5. Devin-Adair, New York.

Mark Twain and the Government, selected and edited by Svend Petersen, \$3.50. Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho.

Roosevelt's Road to Russia, by George N. Crocker, \$5. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Illinois.

The Nature of the Enemy, by Reuben Maury, New York *News* editorial writer, 25 cents. America's Future, 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, New York.

The John Franklin Letters, imaginary series of commentaries written from 1957 to 1976, \$2. Bookmailer, Inc., New York 16, New York.

The Great Farm Problem, by William H. Peterson, \$5. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Illinois.

Fulton Lewis: The libel suit against Fulton Lewis, Jr., which resulted in a \$145,000 verdict, the largest libel judgment in the history of the District of Columbia, has been settled out of court.

Pearl A. Wanamaker, former Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Washington, had won the award for statements Lewis made about her in a broadcast on January 6, 1956.

The judgment was set aside by District Court Judge George L. Hart, Jr., who said the jury must have been prejudiced against Lewis.

Although attorneys for both sides said there was an agreement, they would not reveal the terms or amount of the settlement. Mrs. Wanamaker said in an affidavit filed with the court that Judge Hart had urged her to accept \$30,000 presumably offered during the trial.

Lewis had criticized Mrs. Wanamaker's participation in a White House conference on education and her support of Mrs. Schuddakopf, the school teacher who had invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about her membership in the Communist party. That part of his broadcast, Lewis did not retract. But he made a mistake in identity. He said that Mrs. Wanamaker's brother had fled behind the Iron Curtain.

In his next broadcast, Lewis admitted he had made a "horrifying mistake." It was Mrs. Schuddakopf's brother who defected, not Mrs. Wanamaker's. Lewis offered Mrs. Wanamaker the full period of his broadcast in which to say anything she wished.

At the time of the broadcast, Mrs. Wanamaker had become a controversial figure in the State of Washington. Mrs. Schuddakopf, Tacoma public school teacher, was fired by the superintendent of schools after she took the Fifth Amendment. Mrs. Wanamaker reinstated her. Veterans organizations made this reinstatement an issue in the next political campaign and Mrs. Wanamaker was defeated for re-election.

After the Lewis broadcast, Mrs. Wanamaker filed 17 separate actions against Lewis and the Mutual Network in 12 states and also individually against 30 radio stations. The sum total of her claims added up to \$12 million. Observers have described the irony of her suits in roughly the following language: Mrs. Wanamaker saw millions of dollars worth of damage to herself in being mistakenly accused of having a brother who defected—even though the mistake was immediately and publicly corrected. But what evidence has Mrs. Wanamaker given of recognizing any damage to the hundreds of Tacoma school children taught by Mrs. Schuddakopf, who actually had a brother who defected and who took the Fifth Amendment when asked about her own Communist party membership?

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1960.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months \$3.

By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year. For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any).

ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1959 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, Editor and Publisher JAMES L. WICK, Executive Publisher
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, Business Manager FRANK CHODOROV, Contributing Editor

Article Section

The Iron Law Of The Rich New Dealer

By JAMES L. WICK

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

RICH MEN, rich men's sons and the husbands of rich women have thrived as candidates for high office in the Northern Democratic party since its once-conservative character was changed by a rich man's son who hated the rich, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Their phenomenal success is one of the paradoxes of our times since class-hate is an integral part of the Rooseveltian creed. New Dealers insist that they are the only true "friends of the ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed."

What is the explanation?

There is one trait—and perhaps only one—that is common to all these wealthy New Deal office holders. That trait is their Pavlovian acceptance of the dictates of COPE (the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education). Check the COPE charts and they all show a near-100 per cent voting record.

Two deviationists must be mentioned—Lyndon Johnson and Robert S. Kerr. They are not Northern Democrats, in the first place; secondly, they vote wrong on oil depletion and natural gas and they do not go quite all the way on civil rights, but "liberal"-labor leaders say they "understand and forgive." They explain that the two men cannot go all the way because of the states they come from, but they regard them as otherwise "politically reliable."

So rigid is this "Iron Law of the Rich New Dealer" that you can state it this way:

If you find a very, very rich Northern Democrat in Congress, you can automatically give 10 to 1 odds that he votes almost 100 per cent COPE.

On the other hand, if you find a Northern Democrat with a voting record less than satisfactory to COPE, you can bet your last dollar that he can be independent only because he is not a rich man. Examples: Lausche of Ohio, Francis Walter of Pennsylvania.

We'll begin this study with a partial list of the rich men, rich men's sons and rich women's husbands who have gone far in the New Deal. What is true of this guinea pig list is equally true of those in this category whose names are omitted.

After that, we'll all go on to tell a fable about how one rich man's son was pushed into politics.

Finally will be a footnote about the richest of all the rich men's sons, Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller.

First, the guinea pig list.

Averell Harriman, former Governor of New York. Father left him nearly \$100 million.

John F. Kennedy, Senator from Massachusetts. Father is worth \$250 million.

G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, Governor of Michigan, heir to a big slice of the Mennen shaving cream fortune.

Philip A. Hart, Senator from Michigan—married \$20 million of the Briggs Auto Body fortune.

James E. Murray, Senator from Montana—inherited multimillions in mining securities.

Robert S. Kerr, Senator from Oklahoma, "the richest man in the Senate," drilling contractor, Chairman of the Board of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc.

Adlai Stevenson, inherited Bloomington (Ill.) *Pantagraph* newspaper stock now worth much more than a million—as well as Illinois farm land and securities. His ex-wife is a Borden heiress. His 1952 and 1956 speech-writing staffs included half a dozen 25-to-35-year-old heirs to great wealth.

Frank Church, Idaho, youngest member of the Senate, heir to Clark mining millions.

Chester Bowles, Congressman, former Governor of Connecticut and Ambassador to India. Made millions out of the firm of Benton and Bowles—since sold. The partners were hucksters rather than businessmen, specialists in the creation of fantasies. They were pioneers in "jingle commercials."

William S. Benton, former Senator from Connecticut. In the Benton and Bowles firm 1929-36. He owns Encyclopedia Britannica and Muzak.

William Proxmire, Senator from Wisconsin. Father wealthy. First wife was Elsie Rockefeller.

Joseph S. Clark, Senator from Pennsylvania, inherited oil millions.

Richardson Dilworth, Mayor of Philadelphia, heir to millions.

Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator from Texas, married \$3 million.

Stuart Symington, Senator from Missouri. At 24, six wealthy uncles made him a company president. After that helpful start, he became notably successful on his own as head of the distressed Emerson Electric Co. of St. Louis. He married into the extremely wealthy upper New York State Republican Wadsworth family.

Herbert H. Lehman, former Senator from New York, heir to banking house fortune.

Theodore Francis Green, Senator from Rhode Island, inherited textile and railroad millions.

● Parenthetically, it should be noted that when the Northern Democratic party does not nominate "liberal" millionaires to office, it may go to the other extreme and choose to recognize important immigrant racial strains: Senators Muskie, Pastore. Lausche, Magnuson, Chavez; Governors Furcolo, Ribicoff, DiSalle, Rosellini.

OUR STORY—whose fictional hero Percival is the dilettante son of a very wealthy family—explains why so many rich men and rich men's sons seek high elective office in the party that pretends to be "the friend of the poor." The fable:

Percival had reached the age where he could expect to exercise increasing authority in the family business. Alarmed by the prospect, the family called a conference. A dozen substitute careers were debated and rejected—until somebody suggested "going into politics."

This proposal rang a bell. But which party?

The family could choose. As a matter of self-protection it made heavy contributions to both parties.

According to our fictionalized account, the family Cynic shocked the assemblage by recommending that Percival become a Democrat and be instructed to give enthusiastic support to every proposal, however extreme, "that promises to help the poor."

The family Matriarch said: "I guess I'm dumber than the rest of you. Please tell me why Percival can't run just as well as a Republican as a Democrat."

Answered the Cynic: "Because he's so filthy rich, that's why. A Republican is expected to vote for economy in government. He must oppose the dogooders who want money from the Federal Government for every conceivable 'humanitarian' program. He should war against the something-for-nothing funny money boys. A poor man can do that without being accused of voting to protect his own wealth. A rich man who made it the hard way can vote the hard way. But the rich man who got it the easy

way is a different breed of cat. Most of the time, he's got both an inferiority complex and a guilt complex, so he's on the defensive. In his anxiety to prove that he loves the Little People he overcompensates.

"It would take toughness of character for Percival to go the Republican route. Playboy Percival will have to become a 'liberal' Democrat; that's all there is to it."

The Matriarch continued: "Don't Democrats as well as Republicans have to justify the position they take on public issues?"

The Cynic answered: "Yes, of course, but the 'liberal' Democrats have a pat answer to every question. All they do is say:

"That's a mighty serious issue, but I can give you the remedy. Turn that entire subject over to the Federal Government. No matter how much money it takes, we've got to solve that problem. We can't put dollars ahead of people. The Federal Government must be given the power and the money with which to cure that terrible condition."

Persisted the Matriarch: "You say that answer fits every situation. Prove it."

"Glad to," replied the Cynic. "I'll give you a dozen problems that could be tossed at a candidate:

"Thousands of people are dying of cancer.

"What about juvenile delinquency?

"Four million people are out of work.

"The downtown areas in our big cities are deteriorating.

"There are some people in our town who have been out of work for years.

"This country needs more roads, airports, schools, more civic auditoriums, more of everything.

"What are all the old people without any income going to do?

"People are living in houses that are 50 to 100 years old, dilapidated, going to pot, etc.

"Wives and children are being deserted by no-good husbands.

"The United States needs more scientists and mathematicians.

"Our boys and girls need more recreational facilities and more summer camps to keep them out of trouble.

"Farmers aren't making enough money.

"For every one of those problems, the 'liberals'

have a single prescription: More money and more power to the Federal Government. Why, even our dilettante Percival can learn those lines."

The family Octogenarian spoke up:

"You're telling us that Percival is really to go after the 'gimme' vote. But I know the Big City where most of the Democratic vote in this state comes from; just making the biggest promises isn't enough. How will Percival actually get the votes?"

"That's no trick at all," replied the Cynic. "The Democratic party all through the Northern states is owned body and soul by the City Bosses and Labor Bosses. In the big cities, 99 per cent of the people the Democrats cater to don't even know the names of the candidates. They follow the orders that come down from on high. Therefore, a Democratic candidate in one of the big cities doesn't have to please the people. He's got to please the bosses—that's all."

Asked the family Matriarch: "What if Percival gets out of line?"

Replied the Cynic, "He won't. The labor bosses get out the vote, but the so-called intellectuals do the selling job for the Big Government, Big Spend philosophy that both groups believe in. The intellectual set will get to Percival and tell him he's the greatest man since Moses. Before long, Percival will believe it all himself; he'll be a bigger Big Spender than anybody else."

The Cynic continued: "Let me give you the clinching argument. Here's Percival, heir to millions, running as the Poor Man's candidate. Can't you see how delighted the 'liberal' columnists will be? They will write that Percival's neighbors and old friends are calling him a traitor to his class, refusing to speak to him; but regardless of the price to himself, Percival is determined to make the supreme sacrifice—because of his great love for humanity."

The Octogenarian took the floor: "But are we doing the right thing? Percival might start as a state senator or secretary of state and go on up to the governorship or the US Senate. If that happens, he could ruin the country."

Replied the Cynic: "Well, my friends, we've got to make up our minds. Do we want Percival to wreck the country or do we want him in the family business?"

The decision to put Percival into politics was unanimous.

SINCE GREAT INHERITED WEALTH is a characteristic of many New Deal leaders, the question arises: "How do these rich young men get that way?"

You can begin with their decision years—when they finish college. Having no need to do anything at all, the question that faces them is: What can they do to "kill time" for the rest of their lives?

The more obvious choices:

(1) They can become playboys. Several of our Guinea Pig specimens started out that way, but after a while, they found it awfully boring.

(2) They can devote themselves to the management of the family fortunes, but they soon discover that the hired hands can do it much better, so why should they waste time in that useless fashion?

(3) They can take over the full operation of one of the family-controlled businesses. But that kind of job isn't any longer what it used to be. For a boy raised in ease, the top responsibility in today's fiercely competitive business world can be cruel and heartbreaking. He must face the rivalry of up-and-coming young men born across the railroad tracks who have been accustomed to nothing else but struggle. His stockholders may be frightened by the disappearance of many famous trade names: Thor washing machines, Crosley appliances, Overland automobiles, Sparton television, *Collier's* magazine, Postal Telegraph. For most rich men's sons, these days, such responsibilities would be entirely too tough a life.

Comes the inevitable question: How about politics? This headline-making career is especially attractive since a very rich young man can often start at or near the top by simply making liberal use of the check book.

Once the decision has been made to "go into public service"—as the very rich describe it—Junior Money Bags can't help but gravitate into the New Deal party. All his experience tends to convince him that "money will buy anything." Running for office, he assumes that he must "buy" the favor of the masses from the public treasury. Harriman, Kennedy, Rockefeller, Lehman and many other multi-millionaire candidates went down the line almost without exception for every Big Handout, Big Subsidy program.

A rich man—or a rich man's son—has an obsessive fear of being tarred as "anti-labor." What better way to forestall such smear-words than by getting the support of the labor leaders. And these wise old birds know a good thing when they see it; there is no puppet like a rich puppet.

Soapy Williams' family owns most of the stock of the famous Mennen shaving cream company founded by Soapy's grandfather, Gerhard Mennen. Soapy's mother is vice president. Soapy and his

two brothers are directors. His uncle is president and three cousins are directors. In Morris Plains, New Jersey, where the Mennen plant is located, it is often stated that the Mennens are as conservative politically as Soapy is "liberal." The company operates non-union—a perfect blackjack setup for Walter Reuther. How can Soapy, running in the labor-controlled Democratic party, get the labor vote except by being 100 per cent obedient to the orders, no matter how unreasonable, of the labor bosses?

The New Deal is irresistible for another reason: The "advanced progressive" schools, attended by the children of the rich, indoctrinate their students with the Freudian ethic—"the idea that man cannot and should not be expected to be provident, self-reliant and venturesome; that he must and should be supported, protected and socially maintained."

To believe in this philosophy comes easy to the children of the rich. It suggests the need for an elite—like themselves—who will act as the guardians of the dear dumb masses. So the young rich drift into positions where they can spend rather than earn money and where they can do so "constructively"—playing God by taking care of the lower classes.

THINK OF THE PULL of a welfare-spending political career to Nelson Rockefeller, for example. In his December 26th public statement, he lays to one side his Presidential ambitions. But all his subconscious motivations propel him toward the White House; he will not be satisfied until he gets there. Up to now, young Prince Bountiful has been giving away his grandfather's money. What better training than his for the bigger job of giving away the taxpayers' money?

Notice the ease with which Rockefeller got into the groove when he began his campaign for the governorship. He ran on a platform of saying "yes, yes, YES!" to all the solid-bloc minority groups in New York State. So alluring were Rocky's promises to outspend Averell that New York Post publisher Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, who had been a devoted Harrimanite, could not control herself. In the final edition of her newspaper on the day before election, she switched to Rocky.

Rockefeller's first budget for the State of New York called for an expenditure of \$2.04 billion as compared with Harriman's last and highest of \$1.8 billion and Dewey's last and highest (of four years before) of \$1.2 billion.

Last fall the Governor suggested to the New York Economic Club that there would have to be a 50 per cent increase in government. He subscribes to the doctrine—so easy of belief for those who have never had to earn their daily bread—that the more the people pay in taxes, the richer they will be.

The High Priest of the Eggheads, Harvard professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in his now-famous secret memo to the leadership of the Democratic party declared that it must think in terms of newer and bigger spending. He warned that otherwise Nelson ("We must think in New Dimensions") Rockefeller will slice away from the party a big segment of the self-called "intellectuals." This is no idle threat. The Harvard faculty voted 5 to 1 for Rockefeller over Nixon; in contrast, the GOP rank and file polled the other way by 3 to 1.

If Rocky is honest, there is one decision he should make before seeking the Presidency—whether in 1960, 1964 or 1968. He should emulate Wayne Morse and quit the Republican party.

In choosing his new party, he should recall a decision once made by his wife. Mrs. Rocky is no ordinary wife—who says "Whatever my husband decides is all right with me." Like Mrs. Roosevelt, she is a strong-willed, ambitious woman. She comes from the very wealthy Philadelphia Mainline Clarks and is related to the very wealthy ultra-"liberal" Pennsylvania Senator Clark. Several years ago, Mrs. Rockefeller said she was disgusted with the reactionary nature of the Republican party. In changing parties, she decided to skip the New Dealish Democratic party. She jumped all the way across to New York City's super-leftist Liberal party.

Nelson Rockefeller, as the richest son of the richest family of them all, is affected by "The Iron Law of the Very, Very Rich New Dealer" even more than were Herbert Lehman, Averell Harriman and Jack Kennedy.

When he goes again for the Presidency, he will have to outdo all the poorer aspirants—even the \$250 million Kennedy—in supporting every proposal, however extreme, that promises "to help the poor."

That way, and that way only, can a billion dollar poor little rich boy have even a slim chance of reaching the White House.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me reprints _____ of "THE IRON LAW OF THE RICH NEW DEALER" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

HUMAN EVENTS